



# When and how to disclose AI use in academic publishing: AMEE Guide No.192

J. Cleland, E. Driessen, K. Masters, L. Lingard & L. A. Maggio

**To cite this article:** J. Cleland, E. Driessen, K. Masters, L. Lingard & L. A. Maggio (2026) When and how to disclose AI use in academic publishing: AMEE Guide No.192, Medical Teacher, 48:4, 542-553, DOI: [10.1080/0142159X.2025.2607513](https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2025.2607513)

**To link to this article:** <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2025.2607513>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 30 Dec 2025.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 18003



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



[Citing articles: 15 View citing articles](#)

## When and how to disclose AI use in academic publishing: AMEE Guide No.192

J. Cleland<sup>a,b</sup> , E. Driessen<sup>c</sup> , K. Masters<sup>d</sup> , L. Lingard<sup>e</sup>  and L. A. Maggio<sup>f</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore; <sup>b</sup>Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK; <sup>c</sup>School of Health Professions Education, Faculty of Health Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands; <sup>d</sup>College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Sultan Qaboos University, Muscat, Oman; <sup>e</sup>Centre for Education Research & Innovation, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, London, Canada; <sup>f</sup>Department of Medical Education, University of Illinois, College of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

### ABSTRACT

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools are increasingly integrated into research and academic writing, offering opportunities to streamline workflows and increase productivity. However, these tools also introduce risks when used uncritically, unethically, or without transparency. In particular, the undisclosed use of GenAI, now widely documented, may compromise research integrity. The aim of this AMEE Guide is to provide researchers with practical guidance on when and how to disclose the use of GenAI in scholarly writing. Specifically, we propose a clear framework to promote ethical GenAI use and reporting practices in health professions education research. We start with an exploration of key aspects of responsible use of GenAI in publishing (e.g. authorship, verification and responsibility, plagiarism and bias, data privacy and confidentiality, journal requirements). We then address the importance of transparency about GenAI use in research production, both within research teams (internal disclosure) and to journals and readers (external disclosure). With respect to the latter, we highlight the need to be aware of journal-specific guidance and offer guiding principles for effective disclosure. Central to these principles is the call for scholars to provide a candid description of how GenAI was used, allowing readers to understand how the model shaped the research and writing processes. We also briefly consider the use and disclosure of GenAI in peer review. Given that, at the time of writing this Guide (November 2025), many questions remain regarding AI use and disclosure for publishing, we conclude with reflections on future developments and directions for research.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 25 November 2025  
Accepted 16 December 2025

### KEYWORDS

AI; Disclosure; Publishing

## 1. Introduction

Everywhere you go, every conference you attend, every journal you read includes content on how to use artificial intelligence (AI) to optimize education and training with the aim of preparing learners to work in increasingly digitalised workplaces. In parallel, discussions are underway across all academia as to how the emergence of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) is reshaping research, academic writing, and publishing practices (e.g. [1–3], and See Box 1).

Although the use of AI in medical education had been discussed for some years [7], the public release of ChatGPT 3.5, using a large language model (LLM), in 2022 changed everything, primarily because the power of AI became far more accessible to non-technical people. Just five months later, UNESCO (2023) published a Quick Start Guide titled ‘ChatGPT

and Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education’ [8]. This guide described possible uses of ChatGPT to design research, collect data, analyse data, and write up research. More recently, in the context of academic writing and research, a global survey of over 5,000 authors found 90% reported that using AI was appropriate to edit research articles, and 65% supported its use when drafting them [9]. These findings suggest that AI already sits alongside many authors as a common, if often silent, collaborator [10] in the writing process.

GenAI offers both transformative potential and significant challenges for research [11]. GenAI tools can streamline core elements of the research and writing processes, enabling increased productivity and academic output [12]. However, while GenAI can be beneficial to research and academic writing, it can also be misused, especially if authors approach it uncritically and unethically. Researchers’ use of

**CONTACT** J. Cleland  [Jennifer.cleland@ntu.edu.sg](mailto:Jennifer.cleland@ntu.edu.sg)  Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University, Clinical Sciences Building L18, 11 Mandalay Road, Singapore, 308232.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

**Box 1.** Defining GenAI

Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) is a sub-category of Artificial Intelligence (AI) that has gained considerable prominence, largely due to exemplars such as ChatGPT, which uses a large language model (LLM). GenAI operates by leveraging deep learning from training data and 'transformer' technology [4] to generate human-like content, such as images and words, in response to complex and diverse linguistic inputs, instructions, or inquiries [5,6]. In short, GenAI refers to the use of any tools (e.g. ChatGPT, Perplexity AI) that are able to automatically produce creative texts, images, or other content following a human user's prompt or instruction.

GenAI often goes unreported in manuscripts, potentially compromising research integrity through questionable practices such as incomplete methodology disclosure or inadvertent deception [13] and thus raising critical questions about authorship, transparency, and ethical research practices [14,15].

## 2. Who are we?

As authors, we approach this Guide from a variety of intersecting positions. We are all knowledge producers in health professions education research (HPER); therefore, we seek guidance on how to navigate the benefits and limitations of GenAI, and how to use it transparently and responsibly in our own research. We are also AI users; therefore, we appreciate that we are contributing to our field's co-construction [16] of shared standards for ethical and appropriate AI use. We are knowledge users; therefore, we draw on others' published work, and we require confidence that it is not the result of AI-fabricated data and AI-concocted thinking. Finally, as editors of several major HPER journals, we are knowledge curators; therefore, we feel a responsibility to help our community articulate best practices for the use and disclosure of GenAI in research.

Four of the five authors of this Guide are native English speakers, and all of us have formal training in aspects of English language and literature, which inform our approaches to research and writing. When planning and drafting this manuscript, we discovered that while many of us enjoy the process of academic writing and the opportunity to craft our own unique expression. This enjoyment may, at least in part, stem from our comfort with writing in English, the predominant language of the scientific and educational literature [17]. At the same time, we differ in our research interests and foci, and thus in our epistemological perspectives - differences which extend to our positions on knowledge development and the principles underlying GenAI tools. We use GenAI differently, for example, to plan presentations, polish writing and English, brainstorm counterarguments,

or test emerging ideas. We believe AI represents not only a technical resource but also a means of gaining 'fairer footing' for researchers for whom English is not their first language [18,19], and thus it has potential to diversify our field's knowledge base [20].

Finally, we are aware that the guidance we offer in this AMEE Guide may play a crucial role in demonstrating the HPER community's readiness to adopt GenAI as we will be opening discussion around the roles and responsibilities of key community members [21].

The aim of this AMEE Guide is to offer practical guidance for researchers on when and how to disclose AI use in writing. Specifically, we propose a clear framework for promoting the ethical use and reporting practices of AI in HPER. We begin with a brief exploration of key aspects of responsible AI use in publishing, followed by two sections that outline when and how to disclose the use of AI tools. Given that, at the time of writing this Guide (November 2025), many questions remain regarding the use and disclosure of AI for publishing, we conclude with reflections on future developments and directions for research.

## 3. What is responsible use of AI in publishing?

We are not arguing for or against scholars' using AI, nor are we debating the appropriate usage of AI [22]. Instead, we propose that, while GenAI use can speed up drafting, editing, and idea generation, it does not change the fundamentals of scholarly accountability. Human authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of all journal submissions, whether their manuscript was created with or without AI assistance. As Eva argues, the discussion about responsible use of AI in publishing 'boils down' to the need for human oversight [23], which has implications for authorship, verification of materials, and how one engages in selecting and submitting to a journal. These complexities inform our recommendations about AI use.

### 3.1. Authorship

Before publishers had set policies on the topic, the issue of AI systems as authors on academic papers was hotly debated [24,25]. The debate, however, is not about *technical* ability, but rather about the professional, social, and philosophical status and position of the academic author. As a result, because AI systems cannot accept responsibility, approve a manuscript, or manage conflicts of interest, at the time of writing this Guide, international guidance

from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) is clear that AI shall not be listed as an author [26,27]. Although this has been contested (e.g. 20, 28, 29), many journals, including those in health professions education, now reflect this standard in their author instructions. For example, this journal's publisher, Taylor and Francis notes: 'Generative AI tools must not be listed as an author' [30].

### 3.2. Verification and responsibility

Authors must independently verify and take responsibility for all AI-assisted content. For example, authors seeking to publish in *MedEdPORTAL* are instructed that: 'Authors remain fully accountable for the quality, integrity, and originality of their work, including all content submitted' [31]. In essence, if AI is used, authors should treat its output as unverified notes, not finished scholarship. Therefore, authors should check facts, quotations, and references against the primary sources. They should be especially vigilant for fabricated or 'hallucinated' references, because studies repeatedly demonstrate that LLMs (e.g. ChatGPT, Gemini) can be unreliable when generating citations [22,32]. Authors should also rerun any statistical analyses, code, or calculations conducted by AI to verify accuracy [33,34]. Finally, authors must verify the rights and permissions for any AI-generated images, figures, or text, to monitor for and mitigate hidden copyright risks. This is not straightforward, at least in part because copyright laws differ across countries. However, authors can do a reverse Google search to see if an image/figure has been published previously. For text, they can use plagiarism detection tools to check for similarity to existing publications. Authors can also use meta-data tagging options to document when the image/figure was generated, what tools were used, and any other relevant information to help prove the image/figure was AI generated and not intended to infringe on anyone's copyright.

#### 3.2.1. Practice point

At the time of writing this AMEE Guide, AI tools cannot be listed as authors or take responsibility for the content of academic papers. Human authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of all journal submissions regardless of whether GenAI was used.

### 3.3. Plagiarism and bias

Manuscripts should be screened to detect plagiarism (aka: 'Aigiarism' [35]), including self-plagiarism and

inadvertent text reuse, since AI does not adhere to academic attribution norms [36]. Moreover, because AI models learn from historic data, authors should scrutinize the AI-generated text for potential bias or examples that might inadvertently perpetuate inequalities or harm marginalized groups [37]. For example, when a group of researchers instructed DALL-E3, an AI text-to-image generator, to generate images of Australian medical students, they found that it generated images that were 92% individuals with light skin and 58.8% male, which misrepresents the Australian medical student population and perpetuates gender and race bias [38].

#### 3.3.1. Practice point

Authors must verify the accuracy of any AI-assisted or AI-generated content, ensuring it's free from bias, plagiarism, or copyright infringements.

### 3.4. Data privacy and confidentiality

The texts that AI generates may include sensitive, personal, or confidential information about institutions, patients, or study participants. Similarly, authors must consider privacy and confidentiality of any data they upload into GenAI as some of these tools may store or use this data for future training. Before entering any research data (e.g. interview transcripts, survey responses), especially identifiable, clinical, or institutional information, authors should verify whether such use is permissible under their institution's policies. When working with human subject data, this includes checking with the institutional ethics committee to ensure that uploading data to an AI tool aligns with approved protocols and that it does not violate confidentiality agreements, data-use restrictions, or participants' consent.

### 3.5. Journal requirements

Before discussing journal requirements, it is useful to consider differences in AI usage. A fairly common differentiation is between AI-assisted content and AI-generated content [39,40]. See [Box 2](#) for further explanation.

Journal positions vary in respect of what kind of AI usage is acceptable. Some journals allow authors to use AI for language polishing (i.e. AI-assisted content) but prohibit generating original text (i.e. AI-generated content); some require disclosure in the Methods, others in Acknowledgments; a few (though increasingly less) forbid AI use entirely. Therefore, before drafting a manuscript, authors should consult the target journal's author instructions and any related publisher guidelines. (More about journal requirements in [Section 5](#): When is disclosure

**Box 2.** What counts as AI use in publishing?

*AI-assisted content* refers to work that is initially written by an individual but has been improved with the aid of AI tools. For example, an author might use AI to check spelling or grammar, or improve clarity, in their draft. In this scenario, the author remains firmly in control, with the AI acting as a helpful tool to polish the final product. This is sometimes called AI-assisted copy editing [41].

*AI-generated content* is text that is initially generated by AI in response to a prompt provided by the author. The content, which might be significant portions of text, or even entire sections, may receive minimal editing or revision by the author, or it may be significantly revised – but the initial draft was generated by AI. The closer the resemblance, and the more substantive the ideas that AI contributed, the more important it is to clearly credit its contributions [29].

required?). Note that journal and publisher policies on AI use change frequently and without warning, so it is important to check for the most up-to-date guidance.

Of course, in practice, the line between AI-assisted and AI-generated content is blurred. For example, an author may prompt AI (e.g. ChatGPT) to generate content, but then significantly edit over time, to the point where it is almost unrecognisable from the generated content. In this case, although AI generated the initial content, there is little ‘continuity’ of AI text in the final product [29] – and working with tracked changes is a useful way of recording and assessing the difference between initial and final text. Or consider the situation when an author uploads some of their own (author-generated) materials to ChatGPT, then uses a series of very specific and incremental prompts to ChatGPT, again based on their own work, to help AI write their ideas into a particular textual form, or to glean suggestions for positioning a paper. Is this AI-generated content or AI-assistance? We do not have a simple answer, although we do offer some clarity in the Framework at the end of this Guide. Discussions about this and other ethical dilemmas and challenges associated with AI-usage will evolve over time.

Reiterating the point above, our advice would be to choose your target journal in advance of commencing the writing process, check the journal’s guidelines for AI-usage, make sure you work within this guidance, and disclose appropriately.

#### 4. Why disclose AI use?

Why is it important to disclose GenAI use in research production? Fundamentally, this comes down to transparency, integrity, and accountability. This implies that, instead of focusing on whether AI tools have been used, authors should focus on how much assistance the AI tools provided, what Jenkins and Lin [29] call the ‘continuity’ of AI text in the final product. When disclosure captures the role GenAI

tools – and, conversely, human input – played in producing academic content, it helps other researchers to critically evaluate a manuscript and its specific claims [42] and enables editors to determine whether a submission satisfies their editorial policies [43]. On the other hand, when we fail to disclose in this way, we risk plagiarism, factual errors (e.g. inappropriate attribution, hallucination of references), bias, and misalignment with publishing ethics, as discussed earlier.

#### 5. When must you disclose to journals?

External disclosure (i.e. disclosure to a journal and its readers) is currently the most visible and regulated element of AI-use reporting. In manuscripts, disclosure is warranted whenever an AI tool materially shapes the research or the manuscript. Authors should approach the threshold of ‘materially shapes’ as not merely technical but also epistemic. By this we mean that AI has an active role in the creation, validation and transformation of knowledge – on how new facts get found, how new research gets done, and how all kinds of information spread through society, *via* search engines, in social media environments, *via* the use of electronic devices, and so on. In other words, AI, a non-human, can function as the originator of our beliefs and their content even if the technology itself does not have human-like agency [44,45].

Given this, readers need to know when and how GenAI has influenced the researcher’s thinking, which in turn influences their questions, methods, claims, or presentations, so that they can assess validity and accountability. This includes: drafting or rewriting prose; summarizing literature; structuring arguments [46]; assisting with statistics [33,34], or image analysis; generating or transforming figures; or aiding interpretation (i.e. AI-generated content).

However, authors and Editors often feel unsettled about AI disclosure. Recent empirical and conceptual work provides some insight into why this might be the case. For example, Lingard and colleagues [16], based on interviews with editors, characterize a blurred and shifting boundary around disclosure necessity and sufficiency (how much detail is enough). This blurred boundary is shaped by rapid technological change, the field’s organic construction of disclosure standards, and the imperfect fit of traditional rigor principles, such as reproducibility, with LLM behaviour. Their analysis supports a pragmatic rule for HPER authors: disclose whenever use goes beyond trivial grammar fixes, and when uncertain, disclose. The editorial policies of the journal, *Nature*, reflect this stance:

The use of an LLM (or other AI-tool) for ‘AI assisted copy editing’ purposes not need to be declared. In this context, we define the term ‘AI assisted copy editing’ as AI-assisted improvements to human-generated texts for readability and style, and to ensure that the texts are free of errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation and tone. These AI-assisted improvements may include wording and formatting changes to the texts, but do not include generative editorial work and autonomous content creation [41].

### 5.1. Practice point

Routine assistance, like grammar correction, sentence refinement, or literature search assistance, may be considered normal scholarly practice and do not require disclosure. On the other hand, substantive GenAI use, like generating text, correcting code, generating tables or figures, reducing word count, or checking on analyses, should be disclosed per the target journal’s guidelines (e.g. in the Methods, as a declaration, or Acknowledgements).

Finally, because policies differ across publishers (and even within a publisher’s site over time) authors should check journal-specific instructions at the time of manuscript submission. For example, JAMA’s recent editorial update requires transparent reporting of AI use that affects manuscripts or research and carves out a narrow exception for basic grammar/spell-check, while Springer Nature prohibits GenAI images in publications [47]. Given that policies are a moving target, we recommend a ‘disclose-when-in-doubt’ approach in HPER.

Additionally, if the authors are uncertain of their target journal, they could pre-emptively draft a conservative disclosure statement that satisfies the strictest likely policy, then tailor it to the journal they submit to as needed. Lastly, in the case that a manuscript is rejected, when submitting to a second or third choice journal, authors should check that new journal’s policies and update the disclosure and manuscript accordingly.

### 5.2. Practice point

Because journal policies vary and are evolving, a ‘disclose-when-in-doubt’ approach is recommended.

## 6. What about disclosing to your collaborators?

Notably, the existing literature on AI-use disclosure has largely focused on disclosure to journals at the time of manuscript submission. However, disclosure practices should begin earlier, when research teams plan their studies. Conversations about how, when, and to what extent AI tools will be (and have been)

used during research procedures and manuscript development are crucial for establishing transparency, trust, and shared understanding among collaborators. Early literature suggests that such discussions are not yet common practice [48]. Some authors may hesitate to disclose their use of AI to co-authors due to shame, fear of judgment, or uncertainty about how the disclosure will be received [49,50]. Others may worry about the ‘disclosure penalty’, in which revealing AI use could lead colleagues to question the legitimacy, creativity, or intellectual contribution of their work [51].

To address these challenges, research and author teams can take deliberate steps to normalize and structure disclosure practices around GenAI use. Establishing early and explicit conversations can help clarify expectations, ensure mutual understanding of ethical and journal requirements, and reduce the stigma associated with AI-assisted work. Teams might adopt a simple, recurring check-in at key project milestones to inquire about how AI tools are being utilized, the functions they serve, and whether their use aligns with disciplinary and journal guidelines. Documenting these discussions can also support accurate authorship contribution statements and foster a culture of openness and shared responsibility. By framing disclosure as part of a team’s integrity and quality assurance process, teams can create space for learning, reflection, and the potential for flexibility as GenAI continues to evolve.

These practices parallel guidance around authorship discussions [52]. Discussions about authorship should ideally begin at the outset of a project during the initial planning stages and continue to be revisited regularly as the work progresses. This proactive and ongoing communication helps prevent misunderstandings and disputes in the future. This is especially important when the work is part of a master’s or PhD program. For students, initiating a conversation on authorship can be challenging; thus, the supervisors have the responsibility to lead and support these conversations [53].

### 6.1. Practice point

Research teams should have early, explicit discussions about how, when, and to what extent GenAI will be used during research procedures and manuscript development to clarify expectations, meet ethical and journal requirements, and reduce the stigma associated with AI-assisted or AI-generated scholarship.

## 7. How to disclose?

Table 1 gives examples of how to disclose, but it is important to consider some guiding principles first.

A useful starting point is to treat disclosure as routine methodological reporting, not confession. A helpful way to think of reporting AI-use is to mirror how we already document software: 'Analyses were conducted in SPSS v27' or 'Qualitative coding used NVivo 14'. Following this logic, a good AI disclosure should: name the AI tool and version, state how it was used (e.g. writing, editing, data processing, figure generation, literature summarizing), indicate the extent or significance of its use (e.g. minor language editing versus substantive drafting or analytic contribution), and describe how authors verified the outputs while affirming responsibility for all content.

JAMA's policy operationalizes this: during submission, authors are asked whether AI was used to create text, tables, or figures; if so, they must specify

the tool, version, and usage, and include a corresponding statement in the Methods or Acknowledgments section. For perspectives or essays without Methods, use Acknowledgments or a brief 'Declaration of AI Use' [54]. For HPER papers, the Methods section is ideal when AI has supported research conduct; however, authors should ensure that the responsibility attestation does not get overlooked [10].

Regarding the level of detail to include, practices are evolving. Currently, HPER publications tend toward a minimalist disclosure style [10]. However, brevity and transparency need to be in balance so the disclosure provides sufficient information for readers to assess the nature of AI use and its impact on the scholarship. For instance, more detail may be

**Table 1.** AIHPERD Framework of good practice for writing AI disclosures.

| N | Practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Examples                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Specify the model used. If a local model / version was used, then specify that and include the model's name and version.                                                                                                                                                            | The authors used <i>ChatGPT 5.1 Thinking (OpenAI)</i> / <i>Gemini Pro (Google DeepMind)</i> / <i>Perplexity</i> / <i>Claude (Anthropic)</i> / <i>NoteBook LM</i> / a custom GPT ( <a href="http://...">http://...</a> ) / a version of ChatGPT develop by the University of X'                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 2 | Ensure that you refer to the specific activities for which any AI system was used. Be precise. (Note: because the word 'coding' might refer to both qualitative data analysis or programming, be specific in your declaration.)                                                     | ... to generate three outlines, from which the authors drew ...<br>... to perform an initial literature search ...<br>... to analyse articles ...<br>... to evaluate the Methodology ...<br>... for exploratory cluster modelling. The AI tool suggested potential groupings in the data ..., which the authors manually verified and re-tested.<br>... to propose alternative framings for the central argument ...<br>... to rephrase dense analytic descriptions and better articulate how the iterative phases of data collection and analysis proceeded and influenced the sampling approach ...<br>... to proofread and correct the language and grammar, and to shorten the article's abstract to meet word count requirements ...<br>... to generate Python scripts for data analysis, R-code for generating Figure 3, and writing the MS-Excel macros.<br>... to provide a first translation into English ...<br>... to assist with reference formatting ...<br>... to provide an initial review before submission ... |
| 3 | Declare that consent was obtained if you submitted learner, patient, or other participant data to an AI.                                                                                                                                                                            | Participants consented to their anonymized data being uploaded into an AI system to support analysis.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 4 | Indicate the steps taken to protect uploaded data if you submitted learner, patient, or other participant data to a public model.                                                                                                                                                   | We turned off the 'Improve the model for everyone' setting in ChatGPT to ensure data was retained within the private chat. ... accessed ChatGPT through an API, thereby ensuring that users' data would not be used for training data.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 5 | Consider explicitly stating when you did not use an AI tool where there may be a plausible reason to expect that one was used but was not.                                                                                                                                          | The model was not used to code data or to generate interpretations.<br>AI systems were not used for any image-generation.<br>All AI generated suggestions were discussed by the authors and any written material revised by the authors, who determined the final line of argument and which of the various orientations to engage in the discussion.<br>... which were manually verified and re-tested by the authors.<br>The research team made all analytic decisions and interpretations.<br>All text was reviewed and revised by the authors for accuracy and tone.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 6 | Refer to the journal, publisher, or author institution policy regarding GenAI, showing that you have read and acknowledge your use of AI within those policy boundaries, just as you would declare conformity with the Declaration of Helsinki, use of PRISMA, or other guidelines. | ... in line with the University's AI policies ( <a href="http://...">http://...</a> )<br>... in line with the Journals' AI guidelines ( <a href="http://...">http://...</a> )                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 7 | Make a final statement of responsibility, even if the journal policy does not explicitly require it.                                                                                                                                                                                | The authors assume full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the scientific content presented in this publication.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 8 | Keep a record of the prompt/s, where possible, in case requested by editors. Similar to data, consider making these available to readers upon reasonable request.                                                                                                                   | Prompts are / the full interaction is / available from the contact author on reasonable request / supplied in Appendix A.<br><b>NOTE:</b> in ChatGPT, use the 'Share' feature, or the browser extension 'Save as PDF' ( <a href="https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/save-as-pdf/">https://addons.mozilla.org/en-US/firefox/addon/save-as-pdf/</a> ).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |

required when the AI model used is less familiar to readers, such as when an author has created their own custom GPT. Authors may also wish to indicate the limits of their use of AI, particularly in scholarly contexts where its use is under debate [55]. For instance, qualitative researchers might disclose that AI was used to compare human and LLM coding of a large interview dataset, but that it was not employed in the interpretive phases of the analysis. While such 'negative disclosures' are appearing in the HPE literature [10], we encourage authors to consider their motivation and impacts, as it is not yet clear how this strategy influences transparency and credibility.

Authors should aim for disclosures that are informative [56]. A recent bibliometric study of AI-use disclosures in medical education journals during the first half of 2025 found that they tended to be superficial in terms, providing limited information about exactly how AI was used and its output verified [10]. Such generic or 'safe' AI disclaimers are understandable: they help authors navigate the risks involved in disclosing AI-use [51]. However, when disclosures convey little meaningful concrete information about how researchers engaged with AI in their scholarly practice, they serve more as virtue-signalling than symbols of scholarly credibility.

The Weaver Artificial Intelligence Disclosure 'AID' Framework offers a practical scaffold to make disclosures specific rather than performative [57]. It uses the familiar language of author contribution to describe the who/what/why/how much of AI involvement in a research manuscript, thereby helping authors avoid generic boilerplate ('AI was used to improve clarity') and enabling readers to see the scholarly interaction between researcher and AI model to produce and verify model outputs. Similarly, Lingard and colleagues advise authors to treat verification as 'a process, not a promise: be transparent about how you verified' [16,p.17]. For example, 'We verified accuracy of AI-produced text by conducting our own PubMed search and reviewing key sources, including checking that any material quoted by AI was accurate. Where we found errors or oversimplifications, we edited the AI text as needed'.

Based on the literature cited above, and Kousha's database of declarations [19], we have created the AI in HPER Declaration (AIHPERD) framework of good practice, including disclosure examples (Table 1).

In addition, one should **not**:

- Write vague and overly general disclosures, e.g., Statements such as 'We used ChatGPT for research and writing this article'. Provide insufficient detail for readers to judge AI impact on the text.

- Apologize or disclose over-defensively, e.g., 'We used GenAI in this study, but limited it only to ....'. You would not write 'We used Excel, but only for the construction of charts ....' Just as you would not apologise for performing your statistical analysis with SPSS, similarly there is no need to apologise for using AI.

In summary, we recommend that authors approach disclosure as reporting rather than confessing. AI-use is not something to be ashamed of: it is a tool that you used thoughtfully and appropriately. The aim of the disclosure should be a candid description of researcher engagement with AI that allows readers to understand how the model shaped the research and the writing – not a safe description that checks the disclosure box without achieving clarity and transparency.

### 7.1. Practice point

Treat disclosure as routine methodological reporting, not confession.

## 8. What about the use and disclosure of GenAI in peer review?

Although this Guide focuses on authors' disclosure of GenAI use, we need also to consider GenAI use in peer-review. Reviewers, like authors, are accountable for the content they produce. Therefore, any use of GenAI in preparing a peer review warrants serious attention.

Although some journals and publishers are exploring the use of AI to support peer-review [58,59], the use of AI by human peer-reviewers is discouraged for several reasons:

### 8.1. Publishers'/journals' policies

Reviewers must ensure their peer reviews meet the professional and ethical standards of the journal. A key concern is confidentiality; manuscripts under review are privileged documents and must not be uploaded, in whole or in part, to AI tools due to risks to confidentiality [60,61]. For example, *Academic Medicine* and *MedEdPORTAL* updated their AI-use guidance to include the use of AI by peer reviewers. The policy prohibits reviewers from uploading confidential manuscripts to AI tools that could breach the confidentiality agreement between journals and authors [31,62].

### 8.2. Expertise and real-world experience

An invitation to review a paper is an acknowledgment of domain and/or methodological expertise,

and a request for critical judgment. For example, judging whether a methodological choice is truly appropriate, innovative, or potentially problematic requires deep domain knowledge and critical thinking that current AI systems cannot fully replicate. GenAI also lacks the lived experience, world knowledge, and domain-specific perspective necessary to judge whether a study is genuinely novel or ethical, or how it fits into broader scholarly debates. Moreover, GenAI is a 'black box', offering no information on how it arrives at a recommendation, which is unhelpful to editors and authors.

In addition to these reasons, there is something questionable about journals' insisting that AI cannot be an author because it cannot be held ethically and morally responsible for what it writes, while simultaneously using AI tools to review papers. 'Rules for thee, but not for me' is the appropriate adage but not the appropriate stance.

However, if the reviewers use an AI tool in a manner that does not violate the journal's confidentiality policy, they should disclose this use. At a minimum, they should identify the name and usage method of the tool (e.g. stating 'I conducted this review with the assistance of [ProductName, Version, from Company, Name, Year]') and describe precisely how it supported the review. This information may be best placed in Confidential Comments to the Author, so it can be seen by both Editor and Author. Editors may request additional detail, such as the prompts used or the AI-generated text, to fully understand the extent of the tool's influence.

At heart, peer review is about judgment and accountability. GenAI may be able to help in terms of rote tasks (e.g. checking adherence to journal requirements [63], but human expertise is needed to assess impact and significance, novelty, and relevance [58,59].

The role of AI in reviewing is discussed further in an editorial by Masters and Cleland [64], in this issue of *Medical Teacher*.

### 8.2.1. Practice point

AI tools are helpful for organising thoughts or managing review tasks, but they cannot replace human judgment or critical evaluation.

## 9. What will the future hold for AI disclosure?

To consider the future for AI disclosure, we must reflect on the past. Historically, the introduction of new technologies into education has been disruptive and has required policy change. The adoption of the electronic calculator, and later, word processors, spreadsheets, and statistical packages all required

adjustment periods. Today, no one is expected to 'declare' use of a word processor, and 'declaring' the use of Excel or SPSS is a routine part of methodological reporting. New educational tools, however, require a period of acceptance before their use is normalised. GenAI tools are in such a period. For that reason, publishers, journals, and educational institutions require disclosure of their use. Over time, this will change: eventually, disclosures will become minimised or routine (like use of SPSS or qualitative data management software packages) or not done at all (like spell-check). Meanwhile, the scholarly community must create standards that provide clarity and transparency, while acknowledging that these standards will evolve, and may do so quickly. The take-home principles, however, remain. And each of us will need to stay abreast of shifting publisher, journal and institution policies.

## 10. Call for research

Research on the use of AI has grown rapidly, yet empirical, work on AI disclosures remains limited. To date, most of this scholarship has focused on documenting the rates of AI disclosure in [10,65] and cataloguing editorial policies [16,39]. Missing is a cohesive program of inquiry that moves beyond description to explore how AI disclosure works in practice, what function it serves, and how it can support research integrity, author team norms, and equity.

A foundational next step could be to understand current disclosure behaviour. Researchers could document when and why authors choose to disclose (or not), how they make decisions about what details to include, and whether their disclosures accurately describe how AI factored into their workflow. Such studies can examine the social and cultural dynamics, such as fear of stigma, concerns about judgment, or uncertainty about editor and peer reviewer expectations, that influence disclosure. Parallel analyses could examine the completeness and clarity of published disclosures and assess whether readers, editors, and reviewers can readily interpret and use these statements in their appraisal of manuscripts.

There is also a need to examine the effects of disclosure on the perception of scholarly communication. For example, researchers could explore how different forms of disclosure influence stakeholders' perceptions of manuscript credibility, rigour, and originality. Additionally, researchers might investigate whether different disclosure formats (e.g. narrative disclosures vs. structured, templated disclosures) or locations (e.g. in the methods section vs. in the acknowledgments) influence perceptions.

Another area of inquiry could evaluate the usefulness and impact of emerging AI-specific reporting guidelines. As AI-specific standards, such as GAMER (Generative Artificial Intelligence tools in Medical Research [66], and extensions of existing guidelines (e.g. CONSORT-AI [67] and PRISMA-AI [68]) gain popularity, researchers can assess whether these guidelines support consistency, clarity, completeness, and transparency in describing how AI tools are integrated into study designs, data handling, and manuscript preparation.

A key priority for future research is to understand the equity implications of disclosure, particularly in the context of HPER. A recent study found that a substantial proportion of authors disclosing AI tools in HPER originate from Global South countries, highlighting that AI is often being adopted by researchers working in settings with fewer institutional supports, less access to professional editing services, or more limited time and resources [10]. Disclosure policies must therefore be examined for their potential to disproportionately burden multilingual scholars, early-career researchers, and those from institutions without formal AI training or infrastructure. Studies should explore whether strict or ambiguous disclosure expectations risk exacerbating existing inequities by privileging authors who are more AI-fluent or are based in well-resourced environments. Understanding these dynamics will be crucial for developing disclosure norms that promote transparency without perpetuating structural disparities in academic publishing.

### 10.1. Practice point

There is a need for a cohesive program of inquiry that moves beyond description to explore how AI disclosure works in practice, what function it serves, and how it can support research integrity, author team norms, and equity.

## 11. Conclusion

In summary, GenAI can undoubtedly enhance the academic writing process, but its use and disclosure must be approached with care. It is essential that authors, reviewers, and editors remain vigilant in maintaining academic integrity, particularly when AI is involved. Authors should verify the accuracy and appropriateness of AI-generated content, ensuring that it does not compromise the originality or validity of their work.

Collectively, we believe it is crucial to establish common standards that promote transparency, accountability, and ethical research practices, thereby shaping our field's response to technological

innovation in ways that advance knowledge production responsibly and rigorously. These standards and guidelines should be practical, easy for authors to implement, and designed to encourage compliance, full disclosure, and truthfulness. Finally, each researcher, and research team, must consider how best to integrate GenAI into their research process, including dissemination and peer review, while ensuring that their use and disclosure uphold scientific integrity.

## Declaration

In preparing this AMEE guide, we used ChatGPT v5 (OpenAI) in two main ways. First, we generated an initial outline based on our first group meeting, which we then adapted, expanded, and restructured through ongoing team discussions and rounds of editing, to create our own outline prior to drafting the paper. Second, during drafting and revision of the manuscript, ChatGPT v5 was used for targeted polish tasks, including improving sentence clarity, enhancing transitions between paragraphs, and refining wording for precision and readability. All AI-assisted edits were reviewed, verified, and, when necessary, further revised by members of the author team, who all maintain full responsibility for the final content of this AMEE Guide.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

## Funding

The author(s) reported there is no funding associated with the work featured in this article.

## Notes on contributors

**J. Cleland** PhD is Professor of Medical Education and Director of the WHO Collaborating Centre for Digital Health & Health Education, Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Nanyang Technological University Singapore.

**E. Driessen** PhD is Professor of Medical Education School of Health Professions Education, Faculty of Health Medicine and Life Sciences, Maastricht University, Maastricht, Netherlands.

**K. Masters** PhD is Associate Professor of Medical Education and Informatics Department, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Sultan Qaboos University, Oman.

**L. Lingard** PhD is Professor, Department of Medicine and Senior Scientist, Centre for Education Research & Innovation, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry, Western University, London, Canada.

**L. A. Maggio** PhD is Professor of Medical Education and Director of Research, Department of Medical Education, University of Illinois, College of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA.

## ORCID

J. Cleland  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1433-9323>  
 E. Driessen  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8115-261X>  
 K. Masters  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3425-5020>  
 L. Lingard  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4150-3355>  
 L. A. Maggio  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2997-6133>

## References

- Lendvai GF. ChatGPT in academic writing: a scientometric analysis of literature published between 2022 and 2023. *J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics*. 2025;20(3): 131–148. doi:10.1177/15562646251350203
- Moorhouse BL, Nejadghanbar H. A response to Szudarski's (2025) book review of 'Vocabulary, corpus and language teaching. A machine-generated literature overview'. *ELT Journal*. 2025;79(3):490–495. doi:10.1093/elt/ccaf018
- Szudarski P. Vocabulary, corpus and language teaching. A machine-generated literature overview. *ELT Journal*. 2025;79(2):325–329. doi:10.1093/elt/ccaf006
- Vaswani A, Shazeer N, Parmar N, et al. Attention is all you need. 2017. arXiv:1706.03762v7. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1706.03762
- Bubeck S, Chandrasekaran V, Eldan R, et al. Sparks of artificial general intelligence: early experiments with GPT-4. 2023. arXiv:2303.12712v5. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2303.12712
- Lim JJ, Regillo CD, Sadda SR, et al. Artificial intelligence detection of diabetic retinopathy: subgroup comparison of the EyeArt system with ophthalmologists' dilated examinations. *Ophthalmol Sci*. 2023; 3(1):100228. doi:10.1016/j.xops.2022.100228
- Masters K. Artificial intelligence in medical education. *Med Teach*. 2019;41(9):976–980. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2019.1595557
- Sabzalieva E, Valentini A. ChatGPT and Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: quick Start Guide. UNESCO; 2023. [cited 19 Nov 2025]. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000385146>.
- Kwon D. Is it OK for AI to write science papers? Nature survey shows researchers are split. *Nature*. 2025; 641(8063):574–578. doi:10.1038/d41586-025-01463-k
- Ans M, Maggio L, Algodi H, et al. The presence and nature of AI-use disclosure statements in medical education journals: a bibliometric study. 2 medRxiv; 2025. doi:10.1101/2025.11.11.25340015
- Bagenal J. Generative artificial intelligence and scientific publishing: urgent questions, difficult answers. *Lancet*. 2024;403(10432)(3):1118–1120. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(24)00416-1
- Nicholas D, Rodríguez-Bravo B, Abrizah A, et al. Where will AI take scholarly communication? Voices from the research frontline. *Learned Publishing*. 2025;38(2): E 2008. doi:10.1002/leap.2008
- Larsson S, Haresamudram K, Högberg C, et al. Four facets of AI transparency. In: Lindgren S, ed. *Handbook of critical studies of artificial intelligence*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd; 2023. p 445–455. doi:10.4337/9781803928562.00047
- Kendall G, Teixeira da Silva JA. Risks of abuse of large language models, like ChatGPT, in scientific publishing: authorship, predatory publishing, and paper mills. *Learned Publishing*. 2024;37(1):55–62. doi:10.1002/leap.1578
- Stahl BC, Eke D. The ethics of ChatGPT—Exploring the ethical issues of an emerging technology. *Int J Inf Manage*. 2024;74:102700. doi:10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102700
- Lingard L, Driessen E, Oswald K. The blurred threshold of AI-use disclosure: international journal editors' expectations of sufficiency and necessity. *Perspect Med Educ*. 2025;X(X):1–10. doi:10.5334/pme.2326
- Amano T, Ramírez-Castañeda V, Berdejo-Espinola V, et al. The manifold costs of being a non-native English speaker in science. *PLoS Biol*. 2023;21(7): E 3002184. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.3002184
- Kiyak Y. [Comment on LinkedIn Post by Ken Masters]. LinkedIn. 2025 Aug [cited 2025 Nov 24]. <https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:7353381051265613825?commentUrn=urn%3A%3Acomment%3A%28activity%3A7353381051265613825%2C7353397186904113153%29&dashCommentUrn=urn%3A%3Acomment%3A%287353397186904113153%2Curn%3A%3Acomment%3A7353381051265613825%29>.
- Kousha K, Thelwall MA. Artificial intelligence to support publishing and peer review: a summary and review. *Learned Publishing*. 2024;37(1):4–12. doi:10.1002/leap.1570
- Masters K. Artificial intelligence and the death of the academic author. *Med Teach*. 2025;47(10):1563–1565. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2025.2523463
- Okai-Ugbaje S, Ardzejewska K, Imran A. Readiness, roles, and responsibilities of stakeholders for sustainable mobile learning adoption in higher education. *Educ Sci (Basel)*. 2020;10(3):49. doi:10.3390/educsci10030049
- Cheng A, Calhoun A, Reedy G. Artificial intelligence-assisted academic writing: recommendations for ethical use. *Adv Simul (Lond)*. 2025;10(1):22. doi:10.1186/s41077-025-00350-6
- Eva KW. Medical education and artificial intelligence: responsible and effective practice requires human oversight. *Med Educ*. 2024;58(11):1260–1261. doi:10.1111/medu.15495
- Thunström AO, Steingrimsdóttir S, Gpt Generative Pretrained Transformer. Can GPT-3 write an academic paper on itself, with minimal human input? *Hal-03701250*; 2022 [cited 2025 Nov 19]. <https://hal.science/hal-03701250>.
- Masters K. Ethical use of artificial intelligence in health professions education: AMEE guide no. 158. *Med Teach*. 2023;45(6):574–584. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2023.2186203
- COPE Council. COPE position - Authorship and AI; 2023 [cited 2025 Nov 24]. doi:10.24318/cvrbms
- International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. Defining the role of authors and contributors. [cited 2025 Nov 19]. <https://www.icmje.org/recommendations/browse/roles-and-responsibilities/defining-the-role-of-authors-and-contributors.html>.
- Miller M. *AI for Educators: learning Strategies, Teacher Efficiencies, and a Vision for an Artificial Intelligence Future*. San Diego, California: Ditch That Textbook; 2023.

29. Jenkins R, Lin P. AI-assisted authorship: how to assign credit in synthetic scholarship. 2023. [cited 2025 Nov 23]. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4342909
30. Taylor & Francis. AI policy. [cited 2025 Nov 19]. <https://taylorandfrancis.com/our-policies/ai-policy/>.
31. MedEdPORTAL. Use of AI tools. [cited 2025 Nov 19]. <https://www.mededportal.org/author#useofaitools>.
32. Chelli M, Descamps J, Lavoué V, et al. Hallucination rates and reference accuracy of ChatGPT and Bard for systematic reviews: comparative analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2024;26: E 53164. doi:10.2196/53164
33. Schwarz J. The use of generative AI in statistical data analysis and its impact on teaching statistics at universities of applied sciences. *Teach Stat*. 2025;47(2): 118–128. doi:10.1111/test.12398
34. Ruta MR, Gaidici T, Irwin C, et al. ChatGPT for univariate statistics: validation of AI-assisted data analysis in healthcare research. *J Med Internet Res*. 2025;27: E 63550. doi:10.2196/63550
35. Khalaf MA. Does attitude towards plagiarism predict aigiarism using ChatGPT? *AI Ethics*. 2025;5(1):677–688. doi:10.1007/s43681-024-00426-5
36. Mazzi F. Authorship in artificial intelligence-generated works: exploring originality in text prompts and artificial intelligence outputs through philosophical foundations of copyright and collage protection. *World Intellectual Property*. 2024;27(3):410–427. doi:10.1111/jwip.12310
37. Resnik DB, Hosseini M. The ethics of using artificial intelligence in scientific research: new guidance needed for a new tool. *AI Ethics*. 2025;5(2):1499–1521. doi:10.1007/s43681-024-00493-8
38. Currie G, Currie J, Anderson S, et al. Gender bias in generative artificial intelligence text-to-image depiction of medical students. *Health Educ J*. 2024;83(7): 732–746. doi:10.1177/00178969241274621
39. Yoo JH. Defining the boundaries of AI use in scientific writing: a comparative review of editorial policies. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2025;40(23): E 187. doi:10.3346/jkms.2025.40.e187
40. Laher S. Can academics use AI to write journal papers? What the guidelines say. 2025 June 26 [cited 2025 Dec 12].
41. Nature Portfolio. Artificial intelligence (AI). [cited 2025 Nov 22]. <https://www.nature.com/nature-portfolio/editorial-policies/ai>.
42. Hosseini M, Resnik DB, Holmes K. The ethics of disclosing the use of artificial intelligence tools in writing scholarly manuscripts. *Res Ethics*. 2023;19(4):449–465. doi:10.1177/17470161231180449
43. Kaebnick GE, Magnus DC, Kao A, et al. Editors' statement on the responsible use of generative AI technologies in scholarly journal publishing. *Med Health Care Philos*. 2023;26(4):499–503. doi:10.1007/s11019-023-10176-6
44. Coeckelbergh M. AI and epistemic agency: how AI influences belief revision and its normative implications. *Soc Epistemol*. 2025;202(20):1–13. doi:10.1080/02691728.2025.2466164
45. Alvarado R. AI as an epistemic technology. *Sci Eng Ethics*. 2023;29(5):32. doi:10.1007/s11948-023-00451-3
46. Hinton M, Wagemans JHM. How persuasive is AI-generated argumentation? An analysis of the quality of an argumentative text produced by the GPT-3 AI text generator. *Argument & Computation*. 2023; 14(1):59–74. doi:10.3233/AAC-210026
47. Springer Nature. Editorial Policies. [cited 2025 Nov 23]. <https://www.springernature.com/gp/policies/editorial-policies>.
48. Maggio LA, Konopasky A. AI, authorship teams and agency: enacting fission and fusion. *Med Educ*. 2025. doi:10.1111/medu.70143
49. Giray L. AI shaming: the silent stigma among academic writers and researchers. *Ann Biomed Eng*. 2024;52(9): 2319–2324. doi:10.1007/s10439-024-03582-1
50. Yang H, Dai T, Mathioudakis N, et al. Peer perceptions of clinicians using generative AI in medical decision-making. *NPJ Digit Med*. 2025;8(1):530. doi: 10.1038/s41746-025-01901-y
51. Bao A, Zeng Y. AI disclosure, moral shame, and the punishment of honesty. *Account Res*. 2025;1–14. doi: 10.1080/08989621.2025.2542197
52. Haas MRC, Maggio LA, O'Brien BC, et al. Strategies for navigating authorship. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2024; 16(1):84–85. doi:10.4300/JGME-D-23-00932.1
53. Maggio LA, Artino AR, Jr, Watling CJ, et al. Exploring researchers' perspectives on authorship decision making. *Med Educ*. 2019;53(12):1253–1262. doi:10.1111/medu.13950
54. JAMA Network. Use of AI in research and publishing. [cited 2025 Nov 23]. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/pages/instructions-for-authors#SecUseofAIinPublicationandResearch>.
55. Cook DA, Ginsburg S, Sawatsky AP, et al. Artificial intelligence to support qualitative data analysis: promises, approaches, pitfalls. *Acad Med*. 2025;100(10): 1134–1149. doi:10.1097/ACM.0000000000006134
56. Hartberg Y. AI writing disclosures are a joke. *Chronicle of Higher Education* <https://www.chronicle.com/article/ai-writing-disclosures-are-a-joke-heres-how-to-improve-them>; 2025 [cited 2025 Nov 22].
57. Weaver KD. The artificial intelligence disclosure (AID) framework: an introduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01904*; 2024 Aug 4.
58. Perlis RH, Christakis DA, Bressler NM, et al. Artificial intelligence in peer review. *JAMA*. 2025;334(17). doi: 10.1001/jama.2025.15827
59. Manrai AK, Ouyang D, Hogan JW, et al. Accelerating science with Human + AI review. *Nejm Ai*. 2025;2(12). doi:10.1056/AIe2501175
60. Cheng K, Sun Z, Liu X, et al. Generative artificial intelligence is infiltrating peer review process. *Crit Care*. 2024;28(1):149. doi:10.1186/s13054-024-04933-z
61. Li ZQ, Xu HL, Cao HJ, et al. Use of artificial intelligence in peer review among top 100 medical journals. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2024;7(12): E 2448609. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2024.48609
62. Academic Medicine. Complete instructions for authors; 2025 [cited 2025 Nov 24]. <https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Pages/InstructionsforAuthors.aspx>.
63. Hoyt R, Limon A, Chang A. Generative AI and scientific manuscript peer review. *Intell Based Med*. 2025; 11:100246. doi:10.1016/j.ibmed.2025.100246
64. Masters K, Cleland J. When and how to disclose AI use in academic peer reviewing. *Accepted for Medical Teacher*. doi:10.1080/0142159X.2025.2609741
65. Ng JY, Maduranayagam SG, Suthakar N, et al. Attitudes and perceptions of medical researchers towards the use of artificial intelligence chatbots in the scientific process: an international cross-sectional survey. *Lancet Digit Health*. 2025;7(1): E 94–e102. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(24)00202-4

66. Luo X, Tham YC, Giuffrè M, et al. Reporting guideline for the use of generative artificial intelligence tools in MEDical Research: the GAMER statement. *BMJ Evid Based Med*. 2025;30(6):390–400. doi:[10.1136/bmjebm-2025-113825](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2025-113825)
67. Liu X, Cruz Rivera S, Moher D, SPIRIT-AI and CONSORT-AI Working Group., et al. Reporting guidelines for clinical trial reports for interventions involving artificial intelligence: the CONSORT-AI extension. *Lancet Digit Health*. 2020;2(10): E 537–e548. doi:[10.1016/S2589-7500\(20\)30218-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(20)30218-1)
68. Cacciamani GE, Chu TN, Sanford DI, et al. PRISMA AI reporting guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses on AI in healthcare. *Nat Med*. 2023; 29(1):14–15. doi:[10.1038/s41591-022-02139-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-02139-w)